



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/047,020	01/15/2002	William Kress Bodin	AUS920010777US1	5700

34533 7590 10/17/2005  
INTERNATIONAL CORP (BLF)  
c/o BIGGERS & OHANIAN, LLP  
P.O. BOX 1469  
AUSTIN, TX 78767-1469

EXAMINER

LIN, KELVIN Y

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2142

DATE MAILED: 10/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/047,020	BODIN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kelvin Lin	2142	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 July 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## Detailed Action

### *Response to Arguments*

Application's argue with respect to claims 1-15 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1,2, 4, 6, 7, 9,11,12, and14 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Maekawa et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6848101).

3. Regarding claim 1, Maekawa teaches a method of control of collaborative devices, the method comprising the steps of:

- providing at least two collaborative devices (Maekawa, col.13, l.25-40), wherein each collaborative device comprises a client device and an embedded Java server (Maekawa, col.13, l.30-33, fig. 17, in which the

component 3a comprises the embedded Java VM and equipment 5a corresponds to the client device and Java server);

- providing a registry service to which the collaborative devices are coupled for data communications (Maekawa, col.6, l.15-20, Fig. 17, in which the center server coupled with collaborative devices via network);
- providing at least one registry table (Maekawa, col.6, l.15-20, the register operation is defined by the script contains the record information), wherein the registry table further comprises registry records, wherein the registry records comprise registry records representing capabilities of collaborative devices (Maekawa, col.3, l.40, fig. 9), wherein the registry records representing capabilities of collaborative devices further comprise data elements describing, for each collaborative device, capabilities (Maekawa, col.3, l. 40, fig.9, in which the information is included in the HTML script), tertiary relationships, and network connectivities (Maekawa, col.9, l.46-55);
- providing a service bundle of OSGI-compliant Java servlets comprising at least one predetermined algorithm for controlling the collaborative devices (Maekawa, col.1, l.40-45, col.5, l.54-58, col.6, l.35-41, OSGI is an standard defined service in the OSGI forum); and
- controlling the collaborative devices in accordance with the predetermined algorithm (Maekawa, col. 6, l.35-41).

4. Regarding claim 2, Maekawa further discloses the method of claim 1 wherein the

predetermined algorithm is dedicated to a particular tertiary relationship, and the predetermined algorithm comprises the further steps of:

- finding a registry record bearing a set point for the particular tertiary relationship (Maekawa, col.6, l.32-34, fig.2, and fig.10, in which it detects the event and records, the tertiary relationship among the temperature, wind velocity and air condition control ) ;
- reading a sensor value of the particular tertiary relationship; comparing the set point and the sensor value, wherein the comparing produces a comparison result (Maekawa, col.6, l.35-41);
- finding, in dependence upon the comparison, a registry record having an identified capability appropriate to the comparison result for the particular tertiary relationship (Maekawa, col.6,l.52-55);
- effecting the capability identified in found registry record (Maekawa, col.6,l.52-59).

5. Regarding claim 4, Maekawa further discloses the method of claim 2 wherein reading a sensor value further comprises the steps of:

- finding a registry record for a sensor for the particular tertiary relationship (Maekawa, col.6,l.35-55, fig.9, in which the equipment corresponds to sensor).
- effecting the capability identified in the found registry record for the sensor (Maekawa, col.6,l.52-59).

6. Regarding claim 6, claiming a system for control of collaborative devices, has

similar limitations as claim 1. Therefore, claim 6 is rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 1.

7. Regarding claim 7, has similar limitations as claim 2. Therefore, claim 7 is rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 2.

8. Regarding claim 9, has similar limitations as claim 4. Therefore, claim 9 is rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 4.

9. Regarding claim 11, claiming for a computer program product for control of collaborative devices, has similar limitations as claim 1. Therefore, claim 11 is rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 1.

10. Regarding claim 12, claiming for means plus function, has similar limitations as claim 2. Therefore, claim 7 is rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 2.

11. Regarding claim 14, claiming for means plus function, has similar limitations as claim 4. Therefore, claim 14 is rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 4.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 3, 5, 8, 10, 13, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maekawa in view of Cheng et al., (US PG Pub No. 2001/0032273).

Although Maekawa teaches a method of control of collaborative devices predetermined algorithm, and XML. Maekawa fails to explicitly teach the usage of HTTP and URL.

However, regarding claim 3, Cheng further discloses the method of claim 2 wherein effecting the capability identified in the found registry record includes requesting, by use of an HTTP request, a URL identified in the found registry record as a network connectivity (Cheng, [0036], I.1-18, [0038], I.1-9, in which the registry service to get the information using URL locator, and HTTP protocol for information request).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to include the teaching of Cheng for information request and link connectivity to registry service under OSGI.

The motivation for Maekawa to combine with Cheng's user support this system, would be collaborated with the client, interprets the user request and presents to the client information necessary to respond the request will be invoked for a server to access a client information over the network (Cheng , [0040], 1-8).

13. Regarding claim 5, Cheng further discloses the method of claim 4 wherein

effecting the capability identified in the found registry record for the sensor includes requesting by use of an HTTP request, a URL identified in the found registry record for the sensor (Cheng, [0033], in which the architecture of the client corresponds to the sensor for the information request and retrieval).

14. Regarding claims 8, and 10 have similar limitations as claims 3, and 5.

Therefore, claims 8, and 10 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 3, and 5.

15. Regarding claims 13, and 15 have similar limitations as claims 3, and 5.

Therefore, claims 13, and 15 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 3, and 5.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kelvin Lin whose telephone number is 571-272-3898. The examiner can normally be reached on Flexible 4/9/5.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on 571-272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.



Art Unit: 2142

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

10/12/05  
KYL



**ANDREW CALDWELL  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**